Introduced by Senator Burton (Principal coauthor: Senator Vasconcellos) (Coauthors: Senators Scott and Sher)

(Coauthors: Assembly Members Hancock and Steinberg)

December 2, 2002

An act to add Section 1376 to the Penal Code, relating to the death penalty.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 3, as introduced, Burton. Death penalty: mental retardation. Existing law, added by an initiative statute, provides that the penalty for a defendant who is found guilty of murder in the first degree, where special circumstances exist, is death or imprisonment in the state prison for life. In determining the penalty to be imposed, the trier of fact shall take into account whether, as a result of mental defect, the defendant had the capability to appreciate the criminality of his or her conduct or to conform that conduct to the requirements of the law, if this is relevant. A recent decision of the United States Supreme Court has held that the imposition of the death penalty on a mentally retarded person is prohibited by the Constitution.

This bill would define the term "mentally retarded" and would provide that a defendant in any case in which the prosecution seeks the death penalty may apply for an order directing that a mental retardation hearing be held. The bill would specify that the defendant shall present his or her evidence of mental retardation, and once this evidence is presented, the prosecution shall have the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is not mentally retarded. It would provide that the penalty for a mentally retarded defendant found guilty of murder in the first degree where special circumstances which would

SB 3 **- 2 —**

otherwise make him or her eligible for imposition of the death penalty have been found, shall be confinement in the state prison for life without possibility of parole. This bill would also provide that if, after a mental retardation hearing, the court rules that the death penalty is not precluded, the defendant may request a special finding from the jury at a separate phase, following conviction, that the defendant is mentally retarded. It would specify that, if the defendant requests this special finding, the burden of proof shall be on the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, and to a unanimous jury, that the defendant is not mentally retarded. The bill would provide that, if the jury determines that the defendant is not mentally retarded, the jury shall be informed in the penalty phase that evidence of low intellectual functioning or deficits in adaptive behavior may be considered as a mitigating factor in determining punishment. Because this bill would place additional duties on prosecutors, it would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. provisions establish procedures for making Statutory reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. Section 1376 is added to the Penal Code, to read: 2 3
- 1376. (a) As used in this section, 'mentally retarded' has the same meaning as provided in Section 1001.20. (b) In any case in which the prosecution seeks the death penalty, 4
 - the defendant may, at a reasonable time prior to the commencement of trial, apply for an order directing that a mental
 - retardation hearing be conducted. The court shall conduct a

7

- hearing without a jury to determine whether the defendant is
- mentally retarded. At the hearing, the defendant shall present his 9 or her evidence of mental retardation. Once this evidence is
- 10 presented by the defendant, the burden of proof shall be on the 11
- 12 prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant
- is not mentally retarded. The defendant may present further 13
- evidence in response to the prosecution's case. If the court finds

__3__ SB 3

that the prosecution has failed to meet its burden of proof, it shall preclude the death penalty and trial thereafter shall be conducted as in any other case in which a sentence of death is not sought by the prosecution. If the defendant is found guilty of murder in the first degree, with a finding that one or more of the special circumstances enumerated in Section 190.2 are true, the trial court shall sentence the defendant to confinement in the state prison for life without the possibility of parole.

- (c) If a defendant is subjected to an examination for purposes of this section, any statement made by the defendant during the examination shall be inadmissible in evidence against the defendant in any criminal action or proceeding on any issue other than whether the defendant is mentally retarded.
- (d) (1) A ruling by the court that the death penalty is not precluded under this section shall not restrict the defendant's opportunity to introduce evidence of mental retardation during trial or to argue that the evidence should be given mitigating significance. If the trial is conducted before a jury, the jury shall not be informed of any ruling denying a defendant's motion under this section.
- (2) If the court determines that the death penalty is not precluded under this section, the defendant may request a special finding from the jury, at a separate phase, following a conviction of murder in the first degree with a finding that one or more of the special circumstances enumerated in Section 190.2 are true, on the question of whether the defendant is mentally retarded as defined by this section. If the defendant requests this special finding, the burden of proof shall be on the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, and to a unanimous jury, that the defendant is not mentally retarded. If the jury determines that the defendant to confinement in the state prison for life without the possibility of parole. If the jury finds that the defendant is not mentally retarded, there shall be further proceedings on the question of penalty.
- (3) If the matter proceeds to a penalty phase, the jury shall be informed that evidence of low intellectual functioning or deficits in adaptive behavior may be considered as a mitigating factor even though the jurors previously determined that the defendant is not mentally retarded as defined by this section.

SB 3 —4—

SEC. 2. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because the only costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.